



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

case of a corporation incorporated in two states, each taxes the transfer of stock only on the proportion of property in its jurisdiction. *Gardiner v. Carter*, 74 N. H. 507, 69 Atl. 939. Moreover, the taxing of the transfer of stock in a domestic corporation owning property outside the state may have to be similarly limited under the doctrine that property taxable elsewhere cannot be taxed by the state of incorporation. See *Union Refrigerator Transit Co. v. Kentucky*, 199 U. S. 194, 26 Sup. Ct. 36.

TRIAL — PROVINCE OF COURT AND JURY — RIGHT OF COURT TO QUESTION WITNESSES. — In the course of a trial for murder the judge questioned several witnesses in order to develop their testimony more fully than the prosecuting attorney had done. *Held*, that this is not error. *State v. Keehn*, 118 Pac. 851 (Kan.).

In England it has always been considered the right and duty of the trial judge to question witnesses already on the stand or even to call a new witness when he deems it desirable to bring out the truth more fully. *Coulson v. Disborough*, [1894] 2 Q. B. 316. A few American decisions also seem to give him a wide discretion in this matter. *Epps v. State*, 19 Ga. 102; *Lefever v. Johnson*, 79 Ind. 554. But the tendency in this country has been to restrict the exercise of this discretionary power. *Dunn v. People*, 172 Ill. 582, 50 N. E. 137; *Barlow Brothers Co. v. Parsons*, 73 Conn. 696, 49 Atl. 205. The principal case shows a wholesome reaction from this narrow policy. See 1 WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, § 784; 4 *id.* § 2484.

TRIAL — VERDICTS — SPECIAL FINDINGS. — In an action for negligence the defense of contributory negligence was interposed. In answer to a question of the court as to whether the plaintiff used due care, the jury answered, "We do not know." On a general verdict for the plaintiff the plaintiff obtained judgment. *Held*, that the judgment should be reversed. *Minor v. Stevens*, 118 Pac. 313 (Wash.).

In states where the jury can be required to render special findings the general rule is that a party can insist on a definite answer to interrogatories submitted to the jury. *Atchison, etc. Ry. Co. v. Hale*, 64 Kan. 751, 68 Pac. 612. Where the party does not insist on a definite answer, the better view is that a finding such as the one in the principal case is equivalent to a finding adverse to the party having the burden of proof of the issue. *Croan v. Baden*, 73 Kan. 364, 85 Pac. 532. *Contra*, *Darling v. West*, 51 Ia. 259, 1 N. W. 531. Contributory negligence is an affirmative defense in Washington. *Spurrier v. Front Street Cable Ry. Co.*, 3 Wash. 659, 29 Pac. 346. The decision of the principal case would therefore seem difficult to support.

TRUSTS — CESTUI'S INTEREST IN RES — APPORTIONMENT OF RENT BETWEEN LIFE-TENANT AND REMAINDERMAN. — A lease of trust property was made, by which "rent" was to be paid in a certain sum in cash at the signing of the lease and monthly payments thereafter. *Held*, that the sum paid on signing the lease should not be apportioned in monthly payments throughout the term to the successive *cestuis que trust*. *In re Archambault's Estate*, 81 Atl. 314 (Pa.).

Strictly, the cash payment here is not rent, but something given in addition to it. Cf. *Hatherton v. Bradburne*, 13 Sim. 599; *Ardesco Oil Co. v. North American Oil and Mining Co.*, 66 Pa. St. 375. See 2 WOOD, LANDLORD AND TENANT, § 445. Such a bonus paid for the privilege of obtaining the lease is a form of casual profits, and the decision appears sound in treating it as income and not *corpus*. A close analogy exists in the fines for renewal of a lease, always considered as income. *Milles v. Milles*, 6 Ves. 761. See LEWIN, TRUSTS, 12 ed., 876. And even if we follow the court and treat the payment as rent, it should properly